



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,766	12/03/2003	Victor S. Chan	CA920030058US1	4216

58139 7590 06/11/2008

IBM CORP. (WSM)

c/o WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.

P.O. BOX 50784

DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

NALVEN, ANDREW L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2134

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/726,766
Filing Date: December 03, 2003
Appellant(s): CHAN ET AL.

Robert A Voigt, Jr
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 25 March 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 26 October 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,453,353	Win et al	9-2002
7,028,180	Aull et al	4-2006
6,760,711	Gillett et al	7-2004

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 17-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al US Patent No. 6,453,353 in view of Gillett et al US Patent No. 6,760,711.

With regards to claims 1, 9, 17, Win teaches a computer program product, system, and method for implementing electronic commerce systems comprising a web site being accessible by one or more users (Win, column 4 lines 20-30 and 34-67, web server with components stored on physical server), the computer readable code means representing the users (Win, column 5 lines 12-15, registered users, column 4 lines 45-51), each user being associated with a unique identity in the system (Win, column 6 lines 1-10, users associated with a particular login, column 6 lines 40-45, associated with a particular username), computer readable program code means for associating a user identity with one of a set of access roles for a security domain (Win, column 5 lines 44-54, associates each user with access rights defined by their role), the access role defining access

privileges for the user corresponding to the user identity (Win, column 5 lines 44-54, associates each user with access rights defined by their role), computer readable program code means for granting or denying access to a user attempting to access a portion of the web site by determining the user identity for the user (Win, column 8 lines 10-16, grants access based upon the user identity, column 3 lines 1-6, denies access based on user identity, column 8 lines 36-46) and determining the access role associated with the user identity for the security domain corresponding to the portion of the web site subject to the access attempt (Win, column 6 lines 10-16). Win fails to teach the security domains comprising a subset of the set of organizations and the on-line stores associated with the organizations in the subset. However, Gillett teaches security domains comprising a subset of the set of organizations and the on-line stores associated with the organizations in the subset (Gillett, column 3 lines 28-60, online stores, column 4 lines 1-10, column 8 lines 20-40). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Gillett's organizational design using online stores because it offers the advantage of allowing small merchants to set up online stores while having a centralized ISP provide the security and maintenance of the websites thereby diminishing the threat of misuse of information (Gillett, column 1 lines 35-62 and column 1 lines 1-15).

With regards to claims 2, 10, and 18, Win as modified teaches carrying out the determination of the access role associated with a user identity for a security domain at user login time (Win, column 6 lines 10-16, when logging in, authorized resources are determined and presented to user).

With regards to claims 3, 11, and 19, Win as modified teaches the set of access roles comprising registered customers and administrator roles (Win, column 4 lines 44-50, roles include

users and administrators, column 5 lines 20-33, users include the role of customer, column 16 lines 3-12).

With regards to claims 4-6, 12-14, and 20-22, Win as modified teaches computer readable program code means operable to define the set of organizations as a tree structure (Gillett, Figure 1, tree structure with ISP 26 as root and merchant computers 24 as leaves. Win, column 5 lines 20-32 and lines 55-56, functional groups of roles own lesser roles), in which the computer readable program code means for associating a user identity with one of a set of access roles further comprises computer readable program code means for associating the user identity with the access role for a selected one of the set of organizations (Win, column 5 lines 24-29, associates users with a particular organization) and computer readable program code means for defining the security domain to include the selected organization (Win, column 5 lines 33-39) and those organizations in the set that are descendants of the selected organization (Win, column 5 lines 54-56).

With regards to claims 7, 15, and 23, Win as modified teaches computer readable program code means for maintaining and providing look up functionality for a table (Win, column 13 lines 50-52, database tables, column 15 lines 44-46, table of user names and user types and look up functionality provided by Registry Repository) comprising rows comprising data representing user identity, organization, and access role associations (Win, column 16 lines 46-53, record includes name, role, and privileges).

Claims 8, 16, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al US Patent No. 6,453,353 and Gillett et al US Patent No. 6,760,711, as applied to claims 1, 9, and 17 above, and in further view of Aull et al US Patent No. 7,028,180.

With regards to claims 8, 16, and 24, Win as modified fails to teach computer readable program code means for providing user identities with associated access roles at user registration to a website. However, Aull teaches computer readable program code means for providing user identities with associated access roles at user registration to a website (Aull, column 9 lines 6-21, registers using web server and receives role certificate). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Aull's registration method because it offers the advantage of providing a method by which all parties involved may give their approval to the granting of a role to a user (Aull, column 9 lines 10-21).

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant has argued that on pages 3-7 that Win in combination with Gillett fails to render claim 17 obvious for failure to teach all of the claimed limitations. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Appellant initially argues that Gillett fails to teach the subject matter of the preamble including "the web site being accessible by one or more users and comprising a set of on-line stores and a set of organizations." (Appeal Brief, Page 3). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gillett teaches the web site comprising a set of online stores and a set of organizations (Gillett, column 3 lines 28-60, online stores, column 4 lines 1-10 and column 8 lines 20-40). Gillett teaches the limitation by disclosing an organization in the form of a merchant creating online stores (Gillett, column 3 lines 27-33) in the form of a website (Gillett, column 3 lines 40-45). Gillett further teaches that the website is accessible to one or more users (Gillett, column 3 lines 28-60) because websites are accessible to users where the users could include any individual Internet web surfer. In the alternative, the website being

accessible to one or more users could be interpreted as Gillett's merchant accessing or setting up their online stores (Gillett, column 3 lines 45-55).

Appellant further argues on page 4 that Gillett fails to teach "the security domain comprising a subset of the set of organizations and the on-line stores associated with the organizations in the subset." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gillett teaches a security domain comprising a subset of organizations and the on-line stores associated with the organizations in the subset (Gillett, column 3 lines 28-60, online stores, column 4 lines 1-10, column 8 lines 20-40). Gillett teaches a set of organizations by teaching that multiple merchants (organizations) utilize the ISP to create on-line stores (Gillett, column 3 lines 28-60, online stores). Each single merchant (organization) and its associated on-line stores would be a subset of the whole set of merchants (organizations). Gillett teaches that each merchant has a separate security domain by disclosing that each merchant has special security control over his online stores through encryption, decryption, and authentication (Gillett, column 8 lines 20-40, column 8 lines 52-64). As a result, Examiner maintains that Gillett teaches a security domain comprising a subset of the set of organizations in the form of a single merchant.

Appellant further argues on page 6 that Win fails to teach "granting or denying access to a user attempting to access a portion of the web site by determining the user identity for the user and determining the access role associated with the user identity for the security domain corresponding to the portion of the web site subject to the access attempt." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Initially, Examiner notes that Appellant has admitted that Win teaches automatically granting access to users have the stored association role, automatically denying access to users who do not have roles (see Appeal Brief, Page 6). Thus, Appellant admits that Win teaches granting or denying access to a user

by determining the access role associated with the user identity. Further, Win teaches granting or denying access to a user attempting to access a portion of the web site by determining the user identity for the user (Win, column 8 lines 10-25, grants access based upon the user identity, column 3 lines 1-6, denies access based on user identity, column 8 lines 36-46) and determining the access role associated with the user identity for the security domain corresponding to the portion of the web site subject to the access attempt (Win, column 6 lines 10-16). Win teaches the limitation in question by teaching determining the identity of the user by authentication (Win, column 8 lines 4-16) and then determining if a user has the correct role associated with their user identity to access the particular portion of the website they are attempting to access (Win, column 8 lines 10-25). If a user's role authorizes the user to access a particular resource/website then the user will be granted access to that particular resource/website (Win, column 8 lines 28-45, column 8 lines 46-61, static HTML web page is the protected resource). Further, Win teaches the particular portion of the website to which access is requested comprises a security domain because it has an associated security level or role requirement in order to gain access that is separate from other protected websites and resources (Win, column 8 lines 45-61).

Appellant further argues that the rejections of claims 18-23 are improper for the same reasons as provided for claim 17. For the reasons stated above, Examiner maintains that the rejections of claims 18-23 are proper.

Appellant has argued that on pages 8-9 that Win in combination with Gillett fails to render claims 20-22 obvious for failure to teach all of the claimed limitations. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Appellant argues on pages 8-9 that Win and Gillett fail to teach "defining a set of organizations as a tree structure." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Win and Gillett teach the set of organizations as a tree structure (Gillett, Figure 1, tree structure with ISP 26 as root and merchant computers 24 as leaves, Win, column 5 lines 20-38 and lines 55-56, functional groups of roles own lesser roles). Specifically, Gillett teaches a tree structure with an ISP as a root node and merchants as leaves in a tree structure where the merchants further contain leaves as online stores (see Figure 1 and column 3 lines 28-55). Gillett's merchant owned and ISP hosted system is set up as a tree whereby a single ISP hosts multiple merchants who own one or more online stores (see Figure 1 and column 3 lines 28-55).

Appellant further argues on page 10 that Win and Gillett fail to teach "defining the security domain to include the selected organization and those organizations in the set that are descendants of the selected organization." Examiner respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Gillett's system is composed of an ISP who hosts merchants (organizations) who own storefronts. Further, each merchant (organization) exercises special control of their merchant account and all descendant online storefronts (Gillett, column 8 lines 20-40, column 8 lines 52-64). Thus, the security domain encompasses the selected organization (merchant) and those organizations in the set that are descendants of the selected organization (the merchant's online stores).

Appellant has argued that on pages 10-11 that Win in combination with Gillett fails to render claim 23 obvious for failure to teach all of the claimed limitations. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Appellant argues on pages 10-11 that Win and Gillett fail to teach "maintaining and providing look up functionality for a table comprising rows comprising data representing user identity,

organization, access role associations.” Examiner respectfully disagrees. Win teaches maintaining and providing look up functionality for a table (Win, column 13 lines 50-52, database tables, column 15 lines 44-46, table of user names and user types and look up functionality provided by Registry Repository) comprising rows comprising data representing user identity, organization, and access role associations (Win, column 16 lines 46-53, record includes name, role, and privileges, column 13 lines 45-57, database for a particular organization) by teaching database tables and a registry repository. These are both composed of rows of data that may be accessed in a look up operation. Further, data representing user identity, organization, and access role associations is stored by the administration application allowing the lookup and assignment of security roles (Win, column 13 lines 7-22). Appellant asserts that Win fails to disclose an “organization” being part of the table; however, Win teaches that the tables are for a particular organization (Win, column 13 lines 45-58). Thus, Examiner maintains that Win’s table includes organization as well as user identity and access role associations (Win, column 16 lines 46-53, record includes name, role, and privileges, column 13 lines 45-57, database for a particular organization).

Appellant has argued on pages 12-13 that the combination of Win and Gillett lacks motivation. Examiner respectfully disagrees. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Gillett’s organizational design using online stores because it offers the advantage of allowing small merchants to set up online stores while having a centralized ISP provide the security and maintenance of the websites thereby diminishing the threat of misuse of information (Gillett, column 1 lines 30-62 and column 1 lines 1-15). Contrary to Appellant’s assertion, this advantage of Gillett is precisely the reason for incorporating Gillett’s security domains comprising a subset of the set of

organizations and the online stores associated with the organizations in the subset. Gillett provides ample motivation in that Gillett suggests an advantage that most merchants do not have the wherewithal to manage their websites and security and thus it is an advantage to offload those processes to an ISP. Thus, in combining Win and Gillett, Win's access control and role based security is improved by allowing an ISP based centralized online merchant system with security domains for each merchant which ensures that each merchant's private data is kept private and reduces the likelihood of misuse of information (Gillett, column 1 lines 30-62 and column 1 lines 1-15). As a result, Win's access control and role based security system could be applied to an organization (merchant) and its subset of online stores which would aid in protecting merchant information that is valuable and sensitive and ensure that only selected users can gain access to that information or to prohibited resources of the merchant (Win, column 1 lines 47-65).

The motivation and reasoning detailed above applies with equal weight to Appellant's arguments regarding motivation to combine Win and Gillett for claims 20-22 because Win and Gillett were effectively combined through parent claim 17. Examiner has established a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 17, the parent claim of claims 20-22, and thus the motivation for combination is the same as that for claim 17.

Appellant has argued that on pages 16-17 that Win in combination with Gillett and Aull fails to render claim 24 obvious for failure to teach all of the claimed limitations and for lack of motivation to combine. Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Appellant argues on page 16 that Win, Gillett and Aull fail to teach providing user identities with associated access roles at user registration to a website. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Aull

teaches providing user identities with associated access roles at user registration to a website (Aull, column 9 lines 6-21, registers using web server and receives role certificate). Aull teaches the limitation in question by teaching a user who provides his identity (Aull, column 9 lines 35-42) and registers at a registration web server (Aull, column 9 lines 5-15). The user is then processed and approved to receive a role certificate which grants to the user access to be able to add or delete members of a particular role (Aull, column 8 lines 60-67). Thus, Aull teaches providing user identities with associated access roles at user registration to a website.

Appellant further argues against the motivation to combine Aull with Win and Gillett. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Aull's registration method because it offers the advantage of providing a method by which all parties involved may give their approval to the granting of a role to a user (Aull, column 9 lines 10-21). Aull provides further motivation for using the registration and role certificate method in that the certificate provides simple and fast methods of indicating proper approval, authority, or acceptance to the granting of a role to a user (Aull, column 2 lines 13-29). By combining Aull with Win and Gillett, the role based access systems of Win would be improved by enhancing the granting of roles by ensuring that only role grants are only given upon the approval of all necessary parties. Thus, Examiner maintains that a prima facie case of obviousness has been shown.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

Art Unit: 2135

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Andrew L. Nalven/

Examiner, Art Unit 2134

Conferees:

Kambiz Zand

/Kambiz Zand/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2134

/KIMYEN VU/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135